



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ON
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,025	01/29/2002	Paul Steabben Hepworth	20010326.ORI	5916
23595	7590	02/03/2005	EXAMINER	
NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A. 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH SUITE 820 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			CHOI, STEPHEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Offic Action Summary	Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)
	09/890,025 Examin r Stephen Choi	HEPWORTH, PAUL STEABBEN Art Unit 3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Metzger, Jr. et al. (US 4,846,036).

Metzger discloses all the recited elements of the invention including a base (5), cutting means (13), guide means having respective portions wherein one of the portions comprising relatively movable two components (27, 51). Regarding claim 2, a locking lever (65). Regarding claim 3, a grip bar (35), a slid able member having a surface (51), and at least one wing having a surface (27). Regarding claim 6, a pivot pin (63).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metzger, Jr. et al. (US 4,846,036) in view of Schnitzer (US 2,342,700).

Metzger discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for a plurality of ribs and at least one complementary engagement rib. Schnitzer discloses a plurality of

ribs (8) and at least one complementary engagement rib (14). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a plurality of ribs and at least one complementary engagement rib as taught by Schnitzer on the device of Metzger in order to improve locking of guide means in a desired position.

5. Claims 7-9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metzger, Jr. et al. (US 4,846,036) in view of Shiotani et al. (US 5,293,802).

Metzger discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for cam means and a lip. Shiotani discloses a locking lever having cam means (406). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ cam means as taught by Shiotani on the device of Metzger as an alternative means for operating the locking lever. Furthermore, Shiotani discloses a lip (216) for clamping and guiding. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the lip as taught by Shiotani on the device of Metzger in order to facilitate guiding and clamping of the guide means. Applicant should note that the limitation "slot means" is not in compliance with the Supplemental Guidelines published in the Official Gazette on July 25, 2000. Such limitations cannot be used to invoke 35 USC 112, 6th paragraph, and have therefore been given their broadest reasonable interpretation, without considering equivalence. The "means for" must be modified by functional language. Regarding claim 18, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use plastic

mouldings since the use of plastic molding parts is old and well known in the art as admitted by applicant. It is noted that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement of the previous office action has been taken to be admitted prior art because applicant failed to traverse the examiner's assertion.

6. Claims 10-13 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metzger, Jr. et al. (US 4,846,036) in view of Denmead (US 1,826,056).

Metzger discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for article location means. Denmead discloses article location means (31) including a right-angled recess (32), lips (see Figures 1-2), an arcuate slot (see Figure 2), and a clamping element (33). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the article location means as taught by Denmead on the device of Metzger in order to provide means for positioning the workpiece in a desired angle relative to a cutter. Regarding claim 17, the modified device of Metzger discloses an indicator (protractor). However, the modified device of Metzger fails to disclose the indicator provided at the guide means. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the indicator on the guide means on the modified device of Metzger since rearranging parts of an invention is old and well known in the art as admitted by applicant. It is noted that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement of the previous office action has been taken to be admitted prior art because applicant failed to traverse the examiner's assertion.

7. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metzger, Jr. et al. (US 4,846,036) in view of Denmead (US 1,826,056) as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Ruben (US 2,990,862).

The modified device of Metzger discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for a slidable member. Ruben discloses a slidable member (8) to slidably move article location means. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the slidable member as taught by Ruben on the modified device of Metzger in order to provide means for slidably positioning the article locations means along the guide means to facilitate positioning of the workpiece.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 22 November 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant appears to argue that Metzger does not disclose the two components relatively movable together and apart to clamp or release independently of the mechanical connection as claimed.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Metzger discloses the element 51 being in engagement with an inner wall surface 35 independently of the mechanical connection, which moves the element 49 into and out of engagement, while the element 49 is in a released position (see Figures 4-7, col. 6, lines 11-30).

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Choi whose telephone number is 571-272-4504. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 571-272-4514. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sc
1 February 2005


STEPHEN CHOI
PRIMARY EXAMINER